

BILL EMERSON
MEMBER OF CONGRESS
8TH DISTRICT, MISSOURI

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

92-265-120
CAN 92
4475

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2508

August 20, 1994

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

OFFICES:
SUITE 2454
RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-2508
202/225-4404
THE FEDERAL BUILDING
339 BROADWAY
CAPE GIRARDEAU, MO 63701
314/335-0101
612 PINE
ROLLA, MO 65401
314/364-2455

Ms. Lauren "Pete" Belvin
Director, Office of Legislative Affairs
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20554


RECEIVED
OCT 27 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear Ms. Belvin:

Enclosed is a request from Tyrone Garrett of Sikeston, MO. Mr. Garrett has serious concerns regarding equal access to cable and broadcast programming under the 1992 Cable Act. I would like to ask for your careful review of these comments.


I would appreciate knowing of your response, and would appreciate it if you would advise Pete Jeffries of my staff of your reply. Thank you very much for your time and consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,


BILL EMERSON
Member of Congress

BE/pmj

2
No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E _____



SEMO COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

P.O. Box C • Sikeston, Missouri 63801 • 314-471-6594

AUG 11 1994

July 27, 1994

RECEIVED
OCT 27 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The Honorable Representative Bill Emerson
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Bill Emerson:

We are writing this letter to voice concerns we have regarding the implementation and enforcement of Section 19, of the 1992 Cable Act by the Federal Communications Commission.

As a distributor of DBS satellite television programming, in a four county area serving Cape Girardeau, Scott, Mississippi and New Madrid counties in southeast Missouri, it is essential for our company to have equal access to all available cable television programming.


The attached letters to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt from myself, in addition to Rep. Billy Tauzin and other members of Congress, spell out my concerns on this issue.

Our main concern is that we believe Congress had guaranteed equal access to cable and broadcast programming for all distributors with the passage of the 1992 Cable Act. Some programmers such as Time Warner and Viacom have refused to sell programming to some distributors. These exclusive practices will hurt rural consumers and negate the Section 19 of the Cable Act.

We would greatly appreciate your assistance on behalf of rural consumers in Cape Girardeau, Scott, New Madrid and Mississippi counties in working with the FCC to correct this problem.

Sincerely,

Tyrone Garrett
President



SEMO COMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION

P.O. Box C • Sikeston, Missouri 63801 • 314-471-6594

July 27, 1994

RECEIVED
OCT 27 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1219 M Street, NW, Rm. 814
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Hundt:

This letter is in support of the Comments of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (NRTC) in the matter of Implementation of Section 19 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, CS Docket No. 94-48.

Our company is a cable television company serving small towns in southeast Missouri. We have purchased through the NRTC the rights to distribute DBS service in four counties in southeast Missouri. Many of our potential customers will have few choices for receiving television service as they are outside cabled areas.

With the passage of the 1992 Cable Act, we know that the intention of Congress was to allow different providers of television service to have complete access to all programming at fair prices. The access provisions of the 1992 Cable Act have worked well to this point, with one notable exception. USSB has entered into an exclusive programming arrangement with Time Warner and Viacom for programming to the exclusion of the NRTC and DirecTV.

With the vertical integration these companies possess with cable television operators this arrangement will hinder our ability to compete for DBS customers. We believe the FCC should act to enforce the goals of Congress as put forth in the Cable Act and deny any exclusive contract that doesn't allow any distribution system access to cable programming to rural areas. We believe this is what the Cable Act specifically mandated.

We believe the best way to enforce the Cable Act would be to prohibit any exclusive contracts and specify that monetary damages be awarded for program access violations.

Sincerely,

Tyrone Garrett
President

BILLY TAUZIN
Third District, Louisiana

(MONEY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE)
MERCHANDISE MARKETING AND BUSINESS COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN, COAST GUARD AND
NAVIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE

WASHINGTON FIELD OFFICE
TELEPHONE: 202-375-4031
2330 REVEREND HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20516

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-1803

June 15, 1994

DISTRICT OFFICES:

TELEPHONE: 504-888-8388
501 MAGADINE STREET
SUITE 1041
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

TELEPHONE: 504-878-3033
FEDERAL BUILDING, SUITE 107
MOBILE, LA 36680

TELEPHONE: 318-387-8231
210 EAST MAIN STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70660

TELEPHONE: 504-821-8490
ANDREWS PARKER COURTHOUSE EAST
828 SOUTH NOLA BLVD.
GRANDSLAM, LA 70737

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Hundt:

We are writing to ask your help in strengthening the Commission's rulemaking on competition and diversity in video programming distribution.

During the past year a great deal of the energy has necessarily been devoted to the issue of cable rate regulation. Notwithstanding the immediate importance of that issue, many Members of Congress believe that the true answer to improving the video programming distribution marketplace is the promotion of real competition. In the long run we believe that competition -- not regulation -- will achieve the greatest benefits for consumers and result in greater vitality in the industry. Of the many provisions of the Cable Act that are designed to promote competition, none are more important than Section 19, which instructs the Commission to ensure nondiscriminatory access to cable programming by all distributors.

We strongly believe that section 19 is worthy of your serious and immediate attention. We respectfully request that you reexamine the Commission's First Report and Order implementing section 19 in order to eliminate potential loopholes that would permit the denial of programming to any non-cable distributor.

We wish to call to your attention certain disquieting developments heightening our concern about the FCC's program access regulations. We are troubled by the Primestar consent decrees and the effect they may have on program access. We believe the FCC's program access regulations need to be tightened if the full force and effect of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act is to be preserved.

As you may be aware, despite the Commission's well-reasoned brief opposing the entry of the state Primestar decree, the court entered final judgment. Among other things, the state consent decree will permit the vertically integrated cable programmers that own Primestar to enter into exclusive contracts with one direct broadcast satellite (DBS) operator to the exclusion of all other DBS providers at each orbital position. On the other hand, Primestar's ability to obtain all of the programming of its cable owners will be unimpeded by the state consent decree. In its opinion, the court made clear, however, that its ruling was in no way a judgment about the propriety of such exclusive contracts under Section 19 of the Cable Act

RECEIVED
OCT 27 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

or the FCC's implementing regulations and specifically left that question open to be decided by the FCC.

In essence, the state consent decree gives Primestar's cable owners the ability to carve up the DBS market to the competitive disadvantage of non-cable owned DBS providers. This is directly contrary to the intent of Congress. In enacting the program access provisions, Congress specifically rejected the existing market structure in which vertically integrated cable companies controlled the distribution of programming. Congress and the FCC recognized that vertically integrated programmers had both the means and the incentives to use their control over program access to discriminate against cables' competitors and to choke off potential competition, even in unserved areas. Moreover, Congress looked to DBS as a primary source of competition to cable, not as a new technology to be captured by the cable industry.

Congress enacted very strong program access provisions and gave the Commission broad authority to regulate against anti-competitive and abusive practices by vertically integrated programmers. Section 628 (b) makes it unlawful for a cable operator or vertically integrated cable programmer "to engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices, the purpose or effect of which is to hinder significantly or to prevent any multichannel video programming distributor" from providing cable or superstation programming to consumers. Section 628 (c) provides the Commission with the authority to promulgate regulations to effectuate the statutory prohibition and delineates their minimum content.

Upon examination of the program access regulations, we have discovered a critical loophole that seems ripe for exploitation by the cable industry and is directly applicable to exclusive contracts between vertically integrated cable programmers and DBS providers. Section 628 (c) (2) (c) of the 1992 Cable Act contains a broad per se prohibition on "practices, understandings, arrangements, and activities, including exclusive contracts for satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming between a cable operator and a satellite cable programming vendor or satellite broadcast programming vendor, that prevent a multichannel video programming distributor from obtaining such programming from any satellite cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest" for distribution in non-cabled areas. However, Section 76.1002 (c) (1) of the Commission's new rules covers only those exclusionary practices involving cable operators.

The Commission's rule in its present form is inconsistent with both the plain language of the statute and Congressional intent. The prohibition against all exclusionary practices by vertically integrated programmers in unserved areas is clear. While it certainly includes exclusive contracts between cable operators and vertically integrated programmers, the language of the statute does not limit the prohibition to that one example. The regulations incorrectly turn the illustrative example into the rule.

This loophole must be closed and the program access regulation strengthened on Reconsideration. The Primestar consent decree alone makes it clear that the bare minimum regulation of exclusive contracts is insufficient to guard against anti-competitive practices by vertically integrated cable programmers. The Commission's final regulations should provide, as does the legislation, that all exclusive practices, understandings, arrangements and activities, including (but not limited to) exclusive contracts between vertically integrated video programmers and any multichannel video programming distributor are per se unlawful in non cabled areas. In cabled areas, all such exclusive contracts should be subject to a public interest test with advanced approval required from the Commission.

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Page 3

There is one other vital point to note regarding the Commission's program access rules. It has become evident that the cable industry has been attempting to manipulate the Commission's reconsideration proceeding to obtain an overly broad Commission declaration as to the general propriety of exclusive contracts with non-cable multichannel video programming distributors. Any such pronouncement by the Commission would eviscerate the program access protections of the 1992 Cable Act.

Specifically, in addition to and independent of the explicit exclusive contracting limitations imposed by the Act, exclusive arrangements between vertically integrated programmers and non-cable multichannel video programming distributors (MVPD) in many circumstances also violate Section 628(b)'s general prohibition of "unfair practices" which hinder significantly or prevent any MVPD from obtaining access to cable programming. In addition, they may violate Section 628 (c)(2)(B)'s prohibition against discrimination by a vertically integrated satellite cable programming vendor in the prices, terms and conditions of sale or delivery of satellite cable programming "among or between cable systems, cable operators, other multichannel video programming distributors." Accordingly, we urge the Commission to be extremely careful in its decision on reconsideration to avoid any ruling or language which could, in any way, limit the protections against discrimination afforded by Sections 628(b) and (c)(2)(B).


Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential in overview that the Commission add regulatory "teeth" to its Program Access regulations. In the Program Access decision, the Commission generally declined to award damages as a result of a Program Access violation. Without the threat of damages, however, we see very little incentive for a programmer to comply with the rules. Nor is it practical to expect an aggrieved multichannel video programming distributor to incur the expense and inconvenience of prosecuting a complaint at the Commission without an expectation of an award of damages. There is ample statutory authority for the Commission to order "appropriate remedies" for program access violations, and we urge the Commission to use such authority to impose damages (including attorney fees) in appropriate cases. [See, 47 U.S.C. 548 (e) (i)].


DBS has long been viewed as a strong potential competitor to cable if it were able to obtain programming. In the 1992 Cable Act, Congress acted definitively to remove that barrier to full and fair DBS entry into the multichannel video programming distribution market. We think it is of the utmost importance that there be no loopholes which would allow cable or, in light of recent merger activity, cable-telco combinations to dominate the DBS marketplace.


Thank you for your consideration.


Sincerely,


cc: The Hon. James H. Quello
The Hon. Andrew C. Barrett
The Hon. Susan Ness
The Hon. Rachelle B. Chong


RICK BOUCHER
Member of Congress



RON WYDEN
Member of Congress



JIM SLATTERY
Member of Congress


RALPH HALL
Member of Congress


BILLY TAUZIN
Member of Congress


JIM COOPER
Member of Congress


BLANCHE LAMBERT
Member of Congress


MIKE SYNAR
Member of Congress

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

OCT 24 1994

IN REPLY REFER TO:
CN 9404475

The Honorable Bill Emerson
U.S. House of Representatives
2454 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-2508

Dear Representative Emerson:


This is in response to your inquiry on behalf of a constituent, Mr. Tyrone Garrett, President of SEMO Communications Corporation. Mr. Garrett is concerned that DirecTV, an operator of a direct broadcast satellite (DBS) facility, cannot obtain rights to Time Warner and Viacom programming, because such programming is subject to exclusive distribution rights of another DBS distributor, United States Satellite Broadcasting, Inc.

Mr. Garrett also expresses his support for the position of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (NRTC) concerning the Federal Communications Commission's interpretation of Section 19 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. NRTC has requested that the Commission reexamine the legality of exclusive contracts between vertically integrated cable programmers and DBS providers in areas unserved by cable operators. NRTC has asked that the Commission determine that such contracts are prohibited.

NRTC's petition for reconsideration of the Commission's program access rulemaking proceeding is currently pending. As such, any discussion by Commission personnel concerning this issue outside the context of the rulemaking would be inappropriate. However, you may be assured that the Commission will take into account each of the arguments raised by NRTC and the other parties to the rulemaking concerning this issue to arrive at a reasoned decision on reconsideration.

I trust this information is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely,


Meredith J. Jones
Chief, Cable Services Bureau